



**PUBLIC EXCLUDED MINUTES**  
**District Plan Committee**  
**meeting**  
**held on Wednesday 28 February 2018 at 8.30am**  
**at Selwyn District Council,**  
**Rolleston**

**Present:** The Mayor, Councillors M Alexander, D Hasson, M Lemon, G Miller, B Mugford, N Reid, C Watson, P McEvedy Mr D Ward (CEO SDC), Tania Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga), Hirini Matunga (Te Taumutu Rūnanga).

**In attendance:** Chairperson – T Harris (Environmental Services Manager), J Burgess (Planning Manager), B Rhodes (Team Leader – Strategy and Policy), J Ashley (District Plan Review Project Lead), E Hodgkin (Project Manager, District Plan Review), C Friedel (Senior Strategy and Policy Planner), A Mactier (Strategy and Policy Planner), J Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner), R Love (Strategy and Policy Planner), S Burkett (Strategy and Policy Planner), S Hill (Business Relationship Manager), V Barker (Planning Consultant), J Tapper (Planning Consultant), note taker T Van Der Velde (District Plan Administrator).

**Standing Items:**

**1. Apologies**

Councillor P Skelton (Environment Canterbury)  
Councillor J Morten  
Councillor J Bland

Apologies for lateness:

Councillor C Watson  
Councillor N Reid

Absent:

Councillor M Lyall

**Moved** – The Mayor / **Seconded** – Councillor Alexander

*'That the apologies received from the above Councillors be received for information.'*

**2. Declaration of Interest**

Nil.

**3. Deputations by Appointment**

Nil.

**4. Confirmation of Minutes**

**Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Mugford**

*'That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 06 December 2017 as being true and correct'.*

**CARRIED**

**5. Outstanding Issues Register**

Nil.

*The meeting moved to Public Excluded at: 10.20am*

**6. Confirmation of Public Excluded Minutes**

**Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – The Mayor**

*'That the Committee accepts the public excluded minutes of the 06 December 2017 as being true and correct'.*

**CARRIED**

## **Specific Report(s):**

### **1. National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity – Settlement Pattern Review Discussion Document**

Councillor Watson sought clarification of why this report is public excluded?

Mr Burgess clarified that the report is an interim paper to seek some political advice. The Chair added this is not a public document yet and it still subject to discussion at the next Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) meeting therefore to make this public beforehand would be inappropriate. This is consistent with other Councils.

*'McEvedy in 10.18am'*

Mr Burgess discussed that quarterly monitoring indicator reports have previously been brought to Council. Craig Friedel from the project team has been working on the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPSUDC) for Council and also with the GCP in developing the housing and business land capacity reports. These reports are going up to the Chief Executive meeting tonight for further discussion around the short, medium and long term projections for urban growth in the Greater Christchurch area.

The project team are seeking direction from the Committee for the Future Development Strategy required under the NPSUDC. Council are at a point now where Council have results of housing and business capacity assessments and the project team is seeking direction around what Council does next, where do Council push growth if at all and what sort of processes do Council undertake to allow that to occur. Need to be mindful of constraints including time, financial, and linkages with the District Plan Review and other regional planning processes that need to be taken into account.

Mr Burgess then outlined some of the potential options in Section 5 of the report. He also highlighted the two summary tables (Appendix 2) for housing and business land capacity assessments.

Mr Rhodes provided an overview of the summary tables in the report. The Growth Model development looked at our district without the NPS (National Policy Statement) lens of having to add buffers and feasibility assessments. It looked at what the projected growth and capacity would be, down to township level.

Working alongside the Growth Model was the NPS work which looked at the population for the Greater Christchurch area and within Selwyn, which added a 20% buffer for short term and medium term and 15% for long term to the projections. As such they are slightly larger to what the growth model would project. Generally overall there is a shortfall in capacity between 10 year and 30 year timeframe which is to be expected of about fourteen and a half thousand households but within the medium term, 10 years, there is sufficient supply.

However this relies heavily on infill development to occur over that time as well as rural residential areas coming on board, which are not predominate developments in Selwyn. The 'greenfield' areas do run a bit slim towards the end of the 10 year timeframe. The capacity numbers in terms of supply have not had a feasibility tool applied over it to determine if the land is commercially viable and if not we have to discount it. The tool provided to us by MBIE does not work.

Overall the numbers suggest we do have enough land over the Selwyn Urban Development Strategy (UDS) area as a whole. However there are townships within it that do have a capacity shortfall by 2028, being West Melton and Prebbleton. Part of the discussion today is that there will be some changes needed as part of the RPS if the townships are going to grow further. However, according to the work undertaken to date, there is sufficient land available to accommodate projected growth in both the short and medium term.

In terms of business capacity it is much the same. With Industrial there is a significant amount of supply. Commercial B1 could be an issue depending on what numbers Council count with a heavy reliance on Rolleston. Again, there is sufficient supply at a high level across GCP or UDS but some towns have a shortfall within 10 years

Mr Burgess discussed that essentially Council cannot assume that all the land is feasible. Council are working with our economist Market Economics to better understand the feasibility, market demand and cost associated with development. If Council staff assume 100% feasible land with sufficient numbers we will not need to rezone land, so no subsequent changes to RPS are required. To ensure Council have sufficient land to 2028 and beyond our Future Development Strategy will be for a 10-30 year timeframe.

*'Councillor Reid in 10.27 am'*

*'The Mayor out 10.27am'*

Mr Burgess provided an overview of Map A in the report.

Mr Burgess reiterated that Council staff are seeking advice as part of national direction.

Councillor Alexander commented that 5.34 of report talks about potential to infill at Prebbleton and West Melton, however we would not be able to achieve infill in West Melton as there is a total household cap in the RPS. Might be easier way to allow growth in West Melton is to lift that cap and allow some infill to happen on some of the larger sections out on the boundary? And what is the impact of housing affordability if we hold the current limits?

*'The Mayor in 10.32am'*

Mr Burgess advised that the District Development Strategy, and structure plans for Lincoln, Prebbleton and Rolleston are in place to guide development. This discussion can only be enabled through a more comprehensive update to the RPS.

Mr Rhodes clarified that the RPS does not have a household cap for West Melton, but the District Plan does set minimum density requirements.

Councillor Watson expressed his view that Council need to take some risks and stop letting developers go further into our farm land and stop building big car parks next to big buildings and make viable commercial buildings and start putting pressure the other way by filling in and up and not just out. If Council want to build communities Council need to intensify. Council want to engage with developers but not have developers lead our decision making. Council need to put pressure on developers to construct more intensive housing and commercial builds.

Councillor Hasson agrees on not encroaching on farm land and going up.

Councillor McEvedy queried if we are up against our infrastructure boundaries and Council allow infill will it cost Council to develop more infrastructure to support the community. Cr McEvedy reiterated that Council need to be consistent where Council invests. Cr McEvedy supports Cr Watson's view of intensification but wants to make sure Council have the income for infrastructure, which is funded through development.

Councillor Miller sought clarity as to why Leeston and Prebbleton has different rules for rezoning land under the RPS?

Mr Burgess advised that chapter 6 of the RPS governs development within the UDS area, while the remainder of the district is guided only by Council's own strategic plans.

The Chair summarised that Mr Burgess is promoting interim change and it will be up for discussion with the Greater Christchurch Partnership as to what change to the RPS boundary occurs here in Rolleston. This could go out to our Rolleston infrastructure boundary which was set by the Land Use Recovery Plan and Council do this as an interim step. The intensification issue can be looked at through the District Plan Review.

Councillor Watson asked Ms Wati and Mr Matunga what their thoughts were about the Council developing into farmland as opposed to trying to intensify. Ms Wati advised that her focus in the GCP as Ngāi Tūāhuriri is provision for our Pāpakainga / Kāinga Nohoanga.

Councillor McEvedy commented that it is a tough subject with an important decision. He supports intensification philosophically, but does not think we can draw rules around that and stick to it because of numerous problems. Not opposed to expanding boundaries if need be but would like DPR to encourage intensification. Needs to be pragmatic (written into policy in DPR intensification).

Councillor Alexander commented where Council just meet the NPS and UDC requirements is where it needs attention as he believes our desktop analysis is probably optimistic. We need to make sure there is sufficient buffer as it can be a struggle to get infill to happen. This is where tension happens. Council are sitting right on the margin of meeting that national requirement and therefore we may

need to provide some further growth not just at Rolleston but spread out to other centres. He touched on empty sections in zones to meet capacity but no house on them. If we only meet 90% of that infill then we are going to sit under the minimum requirement, therefore we need to have a bit more of a buffer.

Mr Rhodes clarified that the interim decision is mainly around the RPS and changing the ability to expand our towns, not necessarily actually having to do the zoning. If Council do not make that change the towns will be constrained until the RPS changes and that will not likely be completed until around 2024. Not necessarily around rezoning the land but ability to do it if the RPS changes. The reason Council is focusing on Rolleston is because the infrastructure boundary has scope within it and Environment Canterbury can limit the scope of RPS change to the boundary in addition current urban limits until the structure planning has been done. In summary an interim measure to give us the potential to do it should we need to.

**Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – Councillor Mr Ward**

“That the Committee notes the report.”

*That the Committee:*

- i. Agrees to promote an ‘interim’ change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement that will provide opportunities for further business and residential ‘greenfield’ development in Rolleston.*
- ii. Recognises that opportunities for business and residential ‘greenfield’ growth in the other Urban Development Strategy Townships will be considered as part of a full Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review to begin in 2020*
- iii. Encourages intensification of existing residential zoned land to meet demand ahead of new ‘greenfield’ sites, where practicable and possible.*

*Councillor Miller voted against*

**CARRIED**

*Meeting Concluded at: 10.54am*